NUMERICAL STABILITY BOUNDS FOR ALGEBRAIC SYSTEMS OF PRONY TYPE AND THEIR ACCURATE SOLUTION BY DECIMATION

DMITRY BATENKOV

arXiv:1409.3137v1 [math.NA] 10 Sep 2014

Abstract. The Prony system of equations and its higher-order (confluent) generalizations appear prominently in many theoretical and applied problems. For instance, in signal processing these systems arise in recovery of sums of Diracs from a finite number of their Fourier measurements. The accurate and robust numerical solution of Prony type systems is considered to be a challenging problem, in particular reconstructing closely spaced nonlinear parameters ("nodes", e.g. the support of the Diracs) in the presence of perturbed data.

Our first contribution is providing component-wise asymptotic estimates for the numerical condition of the high-order Prony system, when the number of equations can in general be greater than the number of unknowns. These results provide, in particular, an absolute resolution limit for any method whatsoever. Our second contribution is proposing a technique for the overdetermined Prony problem with closely spaced nodes by "decimation", i.e. taking subsets of the equations with indices belonging to arithmetic progressions, and subsequently solving the resulting square systems. We show that solution of a decimated system is as accurate as the solution to the full overdetermined problem. Thus, decimation provides a tool to achieve near-optimal super-resolution.

Key words. Exponential fitting, Prony system, superresolution, decimation, numerical conditioning

AMS subject classifications. 65H10, 42A15, 94A12

1. Introduction.

The system of equations

$$m_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} a_j z_j^k, \qquad a_j, z_j \in \mathbb{C},\ k = 0, 1, \ldots, N-1, \tag{1.1}$$

appeared originally in the work of Baron de Prony [34] in the context of fitting a sum of exponentials to observed data samples. He showed that the unknowns a_j, z_j can be recovered explicitly from $\{m_0, \ldots, m_{2\mathcal{K}-1}\}$ by what is known today as "Prony's method". This "Prony system" appears in areas such as frequency estimation, Padé approximation, array processing, statistics, interpolation, quadrature, radar signal detection, error correction codes, and many more. The literature on this subject is huge (for instance, the bibliography on Prony's method from [2] is some 50+ pages long). Description of the original Prony's solution method can be found in many places, e.g. [35].

The system (1.1) occupies a central role in *sparse modeling*, a contemporary subject with many recent developments. In particular, it arises when reconstructing a linear combination of a finite number of Dirac δ-distributions ("spikes", or simply "Diracs"):

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} c_j \delta(x - \xi_j), \qquad c_j \in \mathbb{R},\ \xi_j \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.2}$$

*Department of Mathematics, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva 84105, Israel
batenkov@math.bgu.ac.il

from its Fourier samples

$$\widehat{f}\,(k) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f\,(t)\,\mathrm{e}^{-\imath kt}\,\mathrm{d}\,t = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} a_j\,\mathrm{e}^{-\imath\xi_j k} \quad a_j \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $a_j = \frac{c_j}{2\pi}$. In many problems [5, 15], the higher order model is considered, namely

$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_j-1} c_{\ell,j}\delta^{(\ell)}(x-\xi_j), \quad c_{\ell,j} \in \mathbb{R},\ \xi_j \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.4}$$

In this case, (1.3) becomes, after a change of variables, the following *polynomial Prony system*

$$m_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} z_j^k \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_j-1} a_{\ell,j}k^\ell, \qquad a_{\ell,j} \in \mathbb{C},\ |z_j| = 1, \tag{1.5}$$

where $a_{\ell,j} = \frac{c_{\ell,j}(-\imath)^\ell}{2\pi}$. Yet another generalization of (1.1) is the "confluent Prony" system

$$m_k = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_j-1} a_{\ell,j}k(k-1)\cdot\dots\cdot(k-\ell+1)\,z_j^{k-\ell}, \qquad z_j \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\},\ a_{\ell,j} \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{1.6}$$

It appears for example in the problem of reconstructing quadrature domains from their moments [20, 21]. For additional cases of appearance of multiple poles in applications see e.g. [40].

The unknowns $\{z_j\}$ (or the corresponding angles $\xi_j = \pm\arg z_j$) are frequently called "poles", "nodes" or "jumps", while the linear coefficients $\{a_{\ell,j}\}$ are called "magnitudes".

Issues of numerical stability, or conditioning, of solving (1.1) (1.5) and (1.6) when the left-hand side is perturbed have been recognized for a long time. Starting with the original Prony's method, variety of more stable algorithms have been proposed such as MUSIC/ESPRIT [35], matrix pencils [16, 20], as well as several least-squares based methods [31, 32, 33]. While the majority of these algorithms perform well on simple and well-separated nodes (i.e. with $\ell_j = 1$), they are poorly adapted to handle either multiple/clustered nodes, non-Gaussian noise or large values of N ([10, 31]). In particular, the problem of recovering closely spaced ξ_j is receiving much attention recently under the name "super-resolution problem" [12, 13, 14, 17, 28, 30].

In this paper we present several results which can help both understand the above mentioned difficulties, and also partially overcome these difficulties. All considerations will strictly apply only to the system (1.5), but in fact some of the results are valid also for (1.6) - see e.g. [6]. We assume throughout the paper that the structure of the problem - i.e. the number of nodes $\mathcal{K}$ and their orders ℓ_j - are known a-priori. Our first contribution is providing explicit *component-wise* numerical condition bounds for the recovery of all the unknown model parameters, assuming in general adversarial measurement error and overdetermined setting (i.e. N larger than the number of unknowns). Theoretical analysis (Section 2) as well as numerical calculations (Section

4) of the condition numbers indicate that there is a "phase transition" between ill-conditioned and well-conditioned regimes, the boundary being approximately when the node separation is of the order of $\frac{1}{N}$. Our results describe, in particular, an absolute resolution limit for any method whatsoever. They build upon and significantly extend our earlier work [7].

Our second contribution is proposing a technique for the overdetermined Prony problem with closely spaced nodes by "decimation", i.e. taking subsets of the equations with indices belonging to arithmetic progressions, and subsequently solving the resulting square systems (Section 3). We show that solution of a decimated system is as accurate as the (least-squares) solution to the full overdetermined problem (Section 4). Thus, decimation provides a tool to achieve near-optimal super-resolution.

In Section 5 we discuss relation of the presented results to existing works in the literature, in particular [3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 37].

Building upon the presented ideas, we have recently proposed a novel "decimated homotopy" algorithm, which has been shown to outperform state of the art methods such as ESPRIT in this difficult numerical setting [8]. Decimation also played a major role in our recent proposed algorithm for resolving the Gibbs phenomenon [5].

2. Conditioning of Prony system. In what follows, we assume that the *problem structure vector* $\boldsymbol{\ell} = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{\mathcal{K}})$ is fixed. We denote by $R = R(\boldsymbol{\ell}) := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{K}} \ell_i + \mathcal{K}$ the overall number of unknown parameters of the problem.

For any $N \geqslant R$, we consider the "forward mapping" $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}} : \mathbb{C}^R \to \mathbb{C}^N$ given by the measurements (1.5), i.e:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}\left((a_{0,1}, \ldots, a_{\ell_1-1,1}, z_1, \ldots, a_{0,\mathcal{K}}, \ldots, a_{\ell_{\mathcal{K}}-1,\mathcal{K}}, z_{\mathcal{K}})^T\right) := (m_0, \ldots, m_{N-1})^T,$$
$$m_k := \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} z_j^k \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_j-1} a_{\ell,j} k^\ell. \tag{2.1}$$

Thus, we enumerate the R parameters in the order shown (so that $a_{0,1}$ is assigned the position 1, z_1 is assigned the position $\ell_j + 1$, and so on).

We define the following *component-wise* measure of numerical conditioning for our problem.

Definition 2.1. *Let*

$$\mathbb{C}^R \ni \mathbf{x} = (a_{0,1}, \ldots, a_{\ell_1-1,1}, z_1, \ldots, a_{0,\mathcal{K}}, \ldots, a_{\ell_{\mathcal{K}}-1,\mathcal{K}}, z_{\mathcal{K}})^T.$$

Assume that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) := d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x})$*, the Jacobian matrix of the mapping* $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ *at the point* $\mathbf{x}$*, has full rank. For* $\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, R$*, the* component-wise condition number *of parameter* α *at the data point* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^R$ *is the quantity*

$$CN_{\alpha,N}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| {\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}}^{\dagger}(\mathbf{x})_{\alpha,i} \right|,$$

where ${\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}}^{\dagger}$ *is the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of* $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}$*.*

For square systems, i.e. $R = N$, Definition 2.1 reduces to the one used in [7], and in fact it coincides with the definition of sensitivity of solutions to well-posed algebraic problems given in [39].

For $N > R$ and small $\varepsilon \ll 1$, the quantity $CN_{\alpha,N}(\mathbf{x})\,\varepsilon$ is an upper bound for the first-order perturbation of the solution of the corresponding least squares problem. More precisely, let

$$\mathbf{x}^*(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}) := \arg\min_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbb{C}^R} \|\mathbf{y}(\varepsilon) - \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z})\|$$

where $\mathbf{y}(\varepsilon) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{e}$ is the perturbed data, the error vector $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ satisfying $|\mathbf{e}|_\beta < \varepsilon$ for $\beta = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})$ is a point in $(d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}})_{\mathbf{x}}$, the tangent space of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ at $\mathbf{x}$. Then $\mathbf{x}^*$ is the projection of $\mathbf{y}$ onto $(d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}})_{\mathbf{x}}$, and

$$|\mathbf{x}^*(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}|_\alpha = \left|\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}{}^\dagger(\mathbf{x})\,\mathbf{e}\right|_\alpha \leqslant CN_{\alpha,N}(\mathbf{x})\,\varepsilon.$$

Note that here we assume the same noise level for all samples m_k. More general formulations are possible, but in this paper we do not consider such models for the sake of simplicity.

A central role is played by the so-called "node separation", defined as follows.

DEFINITION 2.2. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^R$ be a data point such that $|z_j| = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}$. For $r \neq s$, let $\delta_{rs} := |\arg z_r - \arg z_s|$ with the convention that $\delta_{rs} \leqslant \pi$. Furthermore, we denote*

$$\delta = \delta(\mathbf{x}) := \min_{r\neq s} \delta_{rs}.$$

Sometimes it will be more convenient to use the absolute distance instead of the angular distance, i.e.

$$\zeta_{rs} := |z_r - z_s|, \quad \zeta := \min_{r\neq s} \zeta_{rs} \tag{2.2}$$

but clearly

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \leqslant \frac{\zeta_{rs}}{\delta_{rs}}, \frac{\zeta}{\delta} \leqslant 1. \tag{2.3}$$

In what follows, all the constants will in general depend on the problem structure vector $\boldsymbol{\ell}$. Also we put for consistency $a_{-1,j} := 0$.

The following estimate of the conditioning of the system (1.5) in the special case $N = R$ is a refinement of the main result in [7]. The proof is presented in Appendix A. The main novelty compared to [7] is the explicit dependence on δ.

THEOREM 2.3. *Assume that $N = R$. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^R$ be a data point (see Definition 2.1), such that $\delta = \delta(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ and $a_{\ell_j - 1,j} \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}$. Then the Jacobian*

matrix $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}^{R\times R}$ *is invertible. Furthermore, there exist constants* $C^{(1)}$, $C^{(2)}$, *not depending on* $\mathbf{x}$ *(and in particular on* δ*), such that:*

$$CN_{a_{\ell,j},R}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(1)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{R-\ell} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|a_{\ell-1,j}|}{|a_{\ell_j-1,j}|}\right),$$
$$CN_{z_j,R}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(2)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{R-\ell_j} \cdot \frac{1}{|a_{\ell_j-1,j}|}.$$

Let us now move to the overdetermined case $N > R$, the main subject of this paper. It has long been known that the overdetermined Prony system (1.1) is numerically stable when the number of equations N is greater than δ^{-1}. Here we present a certain quantitative version of this general principle for the system (1.5), using our definition of condition number as above. For proof see Appendix B.

THEOREM 2.4. *Let* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^R$ *be a data point, such that* $\delta = \delta(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ *and* $a_{\ell_j-1,j} \neq 0$ *for* $j = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}$. *Then the Jacobian matrix* $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times R}$ *has full rank. Furthermore, there exist constants* K, $C^{(3)}$ *and* $C^{(4)}$, *not depending on* N *and* δ, *such that for* $N > K \cdot \delta^{-1}$*:*

$$CN_{a_{\ell,j},N}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(3)} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|a_{\ell-1,j}|}{|a_{\ell_j-1,j}|}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{N^{\ell}},$$
$$CN_{z_j,N}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(4)} \cdot \frac{1}{|a_{\ell_j-1,j}|} \cdot \frac{1}{N^{\ell_j}}.$$

A number of remarks on Theorem 2.4 is in order.

1. For the standard Prony system (1.1), there is no real advantage for increasing the number of samples in order to recover the amplitudes $a_{0,j}$, unless there is some decay in the noise level.
2. The (asymptotic) condition numbers themselves *do not depend on the node separation.*
3. Conditioning of the node z_j depends only on the magnitude of the corresponding highest coefficient $a_{\ell_j-1,j}$.

3. Decimation.

3.1. Introduction. Theorem 2.4 shows that the system (1.5) is well-conditioned when $N \gg 1$. Numerical study of $CN_{\alpha,N}$ (see Section 4 below) reveals a rapid "phase transition" approximately when $\frac{N\delta}{R} = O(1)$. In particular, when $N\delta \to 0$, the numerical evidence clearly shows a much more rapid growth of $CN_{\alpha,N}$. Thus, in order to ensure accurate reconstruction in this setting, it would require extremely small noise levels. This observation is certainly not new, and perhaps not surprisingly, little attempt has been made to develop robust algorithms which invert Prony system in this "near ill-conditioned" setting. Surely, a least-squares approach could be applied, but it would require 1) good initial approximation, and 2) possible computation of ill-conditioned Jacobian matrices.

Here we present a somewhat different approach, based on the idea of *decimation.* We introduce the *decimated Prony system,* depending on a positive integer *decimation*

parameter p, as follows:

$$n_k := m_{pk} = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} z_j^{pk} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_j-1} \left(a_{\ell,j} p^\ell\right) k^\ell, \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, R-1. \tag{3.1}$$

The idea is that instead of solving (1.5) given $\{m_0, \ldots, m_{N-1}\}$ - a difficult numerical problem - one would choose $1 \leqslant p \leqslant \left\lfloor \frac{N}{R} \right\rfloor$ and solve (3.1). This could be a viable approach because, as we demonstrate below:

1. the decimated problem can be solved in an efficient and stable way;
2. the attainable accuracy in the solution to the decimated problem is almost the same as the "best possible accuracy" given by the non-decimated condition number $CN_{\alpha,N}$.

3.2. Decimation - theory. Analogously to Section 2, we define the decimated forward map $\mathcal{P}^{(p)} : \mathbb{C}^R \to \mathbb{C}^R$ as

$$\mathcal{P}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) := (n_0, \ldots, n_{R-1}),$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^R$ is as in Definition 2.1 and n_k are given by (3.1). The decimated condition numbers $CN_\alpha^{(p)}$ are defined as

$$CN_\alpha^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^{R} \left| \left(\left\{ \mathcal{J}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) \right\}^{-1} \right)_{\alpha,i} \right|,$$

where $\mathcal{J}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x})$ is the Jacobian of the decimated map $\mathcal{P}^{(p)}$ (the definition applies at every point $\mathbf{x}$ where the Jacobian is non-degenerate). The decimated separation is

$$\delta_p := \min_{r \neq s} \left| \arg z_r^p - \arg z_s^p \right|.$$

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^R$ be a data point (see Definition 2.1), and let $p \geqslant 1$ be such that $\delta_p > 0$ and $a_{\ell_j-1,j} \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}$. Then the Jacobian matrix $\mathcal{J}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathcal{P}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}^{R \times R}$ is invertible. Furthermore, there exist constants $C^{(5)}$, $C^{(6)}$, not depending on δ and p, such that:*

$$CN_{a_{\ell,j}}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(5)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta_p}\right)^{R-\ell} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|a_{\ell-1,j}|}{\left|a_{\ell_j-1,j}\right| p^{\ell_j-\ell}}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{p^\ell},$$

$$CN_{z_j}^{(p)}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(6)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta_p}\right)^{R-\ell_j} \cdot \frac{1}{\left|a_{\ell_j-1,j}\right|} \cdot \frac{1}{p^{\ell_j}}.$$

Proof. From (3.1) it is clear that the map $\mathcal{P}^{(p)}$ can be written as a composition: $\mathcal{P}^{(p)} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \circ \mathcal{R}_p$, where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is given by (2.1) and $\mathcal{R}_p$ is the rescaling mapping given by

$$\mathcal{R}_p\left((a_{0,1}, \ldots, a_{\ell_1-1,1}, z_1, \ldots, a_{0,\mathcal{K}}, \ldots, a_{\ell_\mathcal{K}-1,\mathcal{K}}, z_\mathcal{K})^T\right) :=$$

$$(b_{0,1}, \ldots, b_{\ell_1-1,1}, w_1, \ldots, b_{0,\mathcal{K}}, \ldots, b_{\ell_\mathcal{K}-1,\mathcal{K}}, w_\mathcal{K})^T =$$

$$\left(a_{0,1} \cdot p^0, \ldots, a_{\ell_1-1,1} \cdot p^{\ell_1-1}, z_1^p, \ldots, a_{0,\mathcal{K}} \cdot p^0, \ldots, a_{\ell_\mathcal{K}-1,\mathcal{K}} \cdot p^{\ell_\mathcal{K}-1}, z_\mathcal{K}^p\right)^T.$$

By the chain rule, $d\mathcal{P}^{(p)} = d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}} \times d\mathcal{R}_p$. But $d\mathcal{R}_p$ is just the diagonal matrix

$$d\mathcal{R}_p = \operatorname{diag}\left\{1, p, p^2, \ldots, p^{\ell_1 - 1}, pz_1^{p-1}, \ldots, 1, p, p^2, \ldots, p^{\ell_{\mathcal{K}} - 1}, pz_{\mathcal{K}}^{p-1}\right\}.$$

By definition, $\min_{r \neq s} |\arg w_r - \arg w_s| = \delta_p$. Taking the inverse, and applying Theorem 2.3, it can be seen that the decimated condition numbers satisfy:

$$CN^{(p)}_{a_{\ell,j}}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant CN_{b_{\ell,j},R}(\mathcal{R}_p(\mathbf{x})) \cdot p^{-\ell} \leqslant C^{(5)} \left(\frac{1}{\delta_p}\right)^{R-\ell} \left(1 + \frac{|b_{\ell-1,j}|}{|b_{\ell_j-1,j}|}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{p^\ell},$$

$$CN^{(p)}_{z_j}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant CN_{w_j,R}(\mathcal{R}_p(\mathbf{x})) \cdot p^{-1} \leqslant C^{(6)} \left(\frac{1}{\delta_p}\right)^{R-\ell_j} \frac{1}{|b_{\ell_j-1}|} \cdot \frac{1}{p}.$$

Now plug in $|b_{\ell,j}| = p^\ell |a_{\ell,j}|$ to finish the proof. □

Now suppose we have a node cluster. Decimation with parameter p can be thought of as "zooming into" the cluster by a factor of p, and thus improving the conditioning of the problem. The following result provides a quantitative measure of this improvement.

COROLLARY 3.2. *Let $\delta^* := \max_{r \neq s} \delta_{rs}$. Assume that $N\delta^* < \pi R$ (i.e. all nodes form a cluster). Then the condition numbers of the decimated system* (1.5) *with parameter $p^* := \left\lfloor \frac{N}{R} \right\rfloor$ satisfy*

$$CN^{(p^*)}_{a_{\ell,j}}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(7)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{R-\ell} \left(1 + \frac{|a_{\ell-1,j}|}{|a_{\ell_j-1,j}|}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{N^R},$$

$$CN^{(p^*)}_{z_j}(\mathbf{x}) \leqslant C^{(8)} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^{R-\ell_j} \frac{1}{|a_{\ell_j-1,j}|} \cdot \frac{1}{N^R}.$$

Proof. Substitution of $\delta_{p^*} = p^*\delta$ (of course $\delta_{p^*} < \pi$) and $p^* := \left\lfloor \frac{N}{R} \right\rfloor$ into Theorem 3.1 leads to the desired result. □

Comparing Corollary 3.2 with Theorem 2.3, we see an improvement of conditioning by a factor of N^R (disregarding the constants) gained by decimating - while staying with the same input size.

Comparing Corollary 3.2 with Theorem 2.4, it is seen that if δ is fixed, then the decimated condition numbers in the region $N\delta^* < \pi R$ decay as N^{-R}, while in the region $N\delta > K$ the rate of decay of the undecimated CN is only $N^{-\ell}$. This qualitative difference, or "phase transition", is also evident from the numerical data in Section 4.

3.3. Decimation - practice. Somewhat surprisingly, the decimated condition number $CN^{(p^*)}$ happens to be very close to the undecimated one, *in the setting* $N\delta \ll 1$. We demonstrate this numerically in Section 4 below. Thus, at this informal level, solving the decimated system provides solution as accurate as one would get if she solved the full overdetermined problem by least squares.

Let us now discuss how the decimated system can be solved in practice. Corollary 3.2 provides a simple recipe: given N measurements, just pick up the R evenly spaced ones having "maximal spread". Since this is now a square system (effectively of constant size), it can be solved efficiently. In [8] we propose such a method based on

polynomial homotopy continuation. In Section 4 of this paper we show that even standard methods such as nonlinear least squares and ESPRIT do not lose accuracy when "fed" with decimated measurements on one hand, and have reduced running time on the other hand.

An important caveat of the decimation approach is that it introduces *aliasing* for the nodes - indeed, the system (3.1) has $w_j = z_j^p$ as the solution instead of z_j, and therefore after solving (3.1), the algorithm must select the correct value for the $p^{\text{-th}}$ root $(\widetilde{w}_j)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. Thus, either the algorithm should start with an approximation of the correct value (and thus decimation will be used as a fine-tuning technique), or it should choose one among the p possibilities - for instance, by calculating the discrepancy with the other measurements, which were not originally utilized in the decimated calculation. Another possibility would be to try different decimation parameters and employ some matching procedure, discarding the spurious roots above.

Let us stress again that we do not expect decimation to be useful in all situations, but rather in the "super-resolution" setting where $N\delta \ll 1$, and $N > R$ - thus providing efficient utilization of the additional available measurements.

4. Numerical experiments.

4.1. Condition numbers. In this section we present numerical study of the quantities $CN_{\alpha,N}$and $CN_{\alpha}^{(p^*)}$, and their comparison with the respective upper bounds given by Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 3.2.

4.1.1. Experimental setup.

1. In all experiments, the nodes were chosen to be evenly spaced and of the same order (i.e. $\ell_r = \ell_s = n$ for all r, s). The variable parameters were $\mathcal{K}$, n and δ.
2. We were interested primarily in asymptotics w.r.t N and δ. Thus, in order to minimize the influence of the magnitudes of the linear coefficients $a_{\ell,j}$, we effectively computed the row sums of the corresponding (pseudo-) inverse Vandermonde matrices $W_N^{\dagger}$ and V^{-1}, see Appendix A and Appendix B.
3. The upper bounds were computed as follows:
   (a) for $N \gg 1$, the leading approximation term is
   $$Bound1_{\ell}(N) := N \cdot \left(H_{\ell_r}^{-1}\right)_{\ell+1,1},$$
   see Proposition B.5, and specifically (B.2) and (B.3);
   (b) for $N \ll 1$: the computed constant in Corollary 3.2 is (see also Corollary A.10)
   $$Bound2_{\ell}(N) := \frac{2^{(R+2(\ell_j-\ell)+1)} \cdot \ell_j}{\ell!} \left(\frac{R}{N\delta}\right)^R \delta^{\ell}. \tag{4.1}$$
4. All calculations were done using Mathematica with 30 digit precision.

4.1.2. Results. The graphs in Figure 4.1 on page 9 below present the computed values of[1] $CN_{\ell,N}$ (solid) and $CN_{\ell}^{(p^*)}$ (thick solid), as well as the quantities

[1]Here $CN_{\ell,N}$ stands for $CN_{a_{\ell,j},N}$ if $\ell = 0, \ldots, \ell_j - 1$ and $CN_{z_j,N}$ for $\ell = \ell_j$.



Figure 4.1: Estimating the condition numbers and their upper bounds

$Bound1_\ell(N)$ (dashed) and $Bound2_\ell(N)$ (dotted). The different values of ℓ are distinguished by color-coding. In each experiment we fixed $\mathcal{K}$, n and δ, while varying N. The horizontal axis is scaled as $\frac{N\delta}{R}$. The plots are semi-logarithmic in the vertical axis.

4.1.3. Conclusions.

1. A "phase transition" between well-conditioned and ill-conditioned regions is seen to occur with the threshold in the range $\frac{N\delta}{R} \in (1, 3)$.
2. In the "near ill-conditioned" (or "super-resolution") region, the decimated condition number are almost identical with the non-decimated ones.
3. The computed upper bounds are somewhat pessimistic but have relatively accurate growth rates.

4. The periodic pattern for $CN^{(p)}$ is seen in the well-conditioned region and it is well-predicted by the theory. For instance, it is easy to see that for infinite number of values of p we have $\pi < p\delta^* < \pi + \varepsilon$ (recall Corollary 3.2), thus δ_p becomes small and $CN^{(p)}$ blows up.

4.2. Least Squares and ESPRIT with decimation. We have tested the decimation technique according to Subsection 3.3 on two well-known algorithms for Prony systems - generalized ESPRIT [4] and nonlinear least squares (LS, implemented by MATLAB's `lsqnonlin`). To avoid the aliasing problem, we assumed an initial approximation to be given. All computations were done in MATLAB with double precision floating point arithmetic. The computed values of m_k were perturbed in a random manner with specified noise level.

In the first experiment, we fixed the number of measurements to be 66, and changed the decimation parameter p, while keeping the noise level constant. The accuracy of recovery increased with p – see Figure 4.2 on page 10.



(a) ESPRIT, $\ell_j = 3$ (b) LS, $\ell_j = 3$

Figure 4.2: Reconstruction error as a function of the decimation with fixed number of measurements ($N = 66$). The signal has two nodes with distance $\delta = 10^{-2}$ between each other. Notice that ESPRIT requires significantly higher Signal-to-Noise Ratio in order to achieve the same performance as LS.

In the second experiment, we fixed the highest available measurement to be $N = 1600$, and changed the decimation from $p = 1$ to $p = 100$ (thereby reducing the number of measurements from 1600 to just 16). The accuracy of recovery stayed relatively constant – see Figure 4.3 on page 11. Such a reduction leads to a corresponding decrease in the running time, since for instance the SVD computation in ESPRIT takes $O\left(N^2 R\right)$.

5. Relation to existing work. In his influential paper [14], Donoho gave bounds for noise amplification (modulus of continuity Λ) for recovery of signed measures from their continuous spectra of width Ω on a lattice with step size Δ in the superresolution setting $\Omega\Delta \ll \pi$. If the measures have at most ℓ nonzero coefficients in any interval of unit length, then Λ is shown to increase at least as $\approx \left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)^{2\ell-1}$



(a) ESPRIT, $\ell_j = 2$ (b) LS, $\ell_j = 2$

Figure 4.3: Reconstruction error as a function of the decimation, reducing number of measurements from $N = 1600$ to $N = 16$. The signal has two nodes with distance $\delta = 10^{-2}$ between each other. The reconstruction accuracy remains almost constant.

and at most as $\approx \left(\frac{1}{\Delta}\right)^{2\ell+1}$. When $\Delta \to 0$, the upper bound effectively increases as $\left(\frac{1}{\Delta\Omega}\right)^{2\ell-1}$, thus the ratio $\frac{1}{\Delta\Omega}$ is called the "super-resolution factor" (SRF).

No practical way to achieve the above bounds have been proposed, however, more recent works of Candes and Fernandez-Granda [12, 13, 17] showed that under an additional assumption of node separation (effectively putting $\ell = 1$ above) a stable recovery via convex programming is possible, both for the ℓ_1-norm and for the locations of the spikes.

While our results are not directly applicable to the above settings, nevertheless a certain comparison is possible by identifying Δ with δ, Ω with N and ℓ with $\mathcal{K}$, and putting $\ell_j = 1$. After this identification, Corollary 3.2 gives an upper bound for the modulus of continuity of the order $\left(\frac{1}{\Delta\Omega}\right)^{2\ell}$, which is consistent with the estimate in [14]. Note that we also provide perturbation bounds for the locations of the spikes in terms of the SRF, a feature notably lacking in the above cited works. The node separation assumption of Candes and Fernandez-Granda appears to be somewhat different from our assumption $N > K \cdot \delta^{-1}$ in Theorem 2.4.

In a recent preprint [30] the authors observed a phase transition for the (unstructured) condition number of Vandermonde matrices, a clear analogy with our results (note that in addition to a similar phase transition, our estimates also predict an exponential increase w.r.t R in the condition number, see e.g. (4.1)).

A method very similar to decimation, called "subspace shifting", or interleaving, was proposed by Maravic & Vetterli in [29] in the context of analyzing performance of Finite Rate of Innovation (FRI) sampling in the presence of noise. Their idea was to interleave the rows of the Hankel matrix used in subspace estimation methods, effectively increasing the separation of closely spaced nodes. They confirmed this idea with numerical experiments. The results of our paper can be considered as a theoretical justification of their approach, and its extension to the more general system (1.5).

In statistical signal estimation, Cramer-Rao Lower Bound (CRB) gives a lower bound for the variance of any unbiased estimator, see [24]). In [27] the authors only prove the CRB estimates for $\mathcal{K} = 1, 2$ and $N \gg 1$, for the system (1.1). On the other hand, the authors of [3] consider the more general system (1.5) (called PACE model), and derive asymptotic estimates for $N \gg 1$. These results are qualitatively similar to our Theorem 2.3 and Theorem 2.4. Obviously our results are different in nature from the CRB, but nevertheless the stated similarity is worth investigating further. Generalized ESPRIT is shown to attain asymptotic CRB for $N \to \infty$.

The effect of oversampling for FRI signals was also studied in [11], where they showed that it can improve performance by several orders of magnitude - a conclusion which is certainly consistent with our Theorem 2.4.

Interestingly, performance analysis of MUSIC in another recent preprint [28] suggests that it can resolve arbitrarily close frequencies below N^{-1} for sufficiently small noise - compare this with Theorem 2.4, which shows that the sensitivity indeed does not depend on the node separation.

Decimation has recently appeared in zooming methods such as ZMUSIC [25] and zoom-ESPRIT [26] for reducing computational complexity and memory requirements for estimating frequencies in a specified range. Experiments show also improvement in accuracy of the zooming techniques w.r.t to their regular counterparts, thus it would be interesting to see whether an analysis similar to ours can be applied also in these cases.

A variant of decimation for Prony systems, so-called "arithmetic progression sampling" (APS) was shown by Sidi to provide convergence acceleration for Richardson extrapolation problems in numerical analysis [37]. It would be interesting to make this connection more elaborate and precise.

A kind of "stochastic decimation" (randomized arithmetic progression sampling) was recently used by Kaltofen et.al for outlier removal in sparse model synthesis and interpolation [23].

6. Some future directions. An important open question connected with stable solution of Prony systems is how to detect the near-singular situations, and choose the problem structure vector $\boldsymbol{\ell} = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{\mathcal{K}})$ in an optimal way. One possible approach might involve symbolic-numeric techniques for polynomial systems, combined with analysis of the singularities of the mapping $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ ([8, 9]).

Decimation appears to provide near-optimal conditioning with respect to the number of samples N, in the super-resolution setting. On the one hand, theoretical justification of this optimality would be highly desirable. On the other hand, applying it also to the stable regime $N \gg 1$ appears to be possible, provided a clever choice of the decimation parameter p which would minimize the condition number. An interesting related question is to provide optimal solution when only some of the nodes form a cluster.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Abramowitz and I.A. Stegun. Handbook of mathematical functions: with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables. 1965.

[2] J.R. Auton. Investigation of Procedures for Automatic Resonance Extraction from Noisy Transient Electromagnetics Data. Volume III. Translation of Prony's Original Paper and Bibliography of Prony's Method. Technical report, Effects Technology Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, 1981.

[3] R. Badeau, B. David, and G. Richard. Cramér–Rao bounds for multiple poles and coefficients of quasi-polynomials in colored noise. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 56(8):3458–3467, 2008.

[4] R. Badeau, B. David, and G. Richard. Performance of ESPRIT for estimating mixtures of complex exponentials modulated by polynomials. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 56(2):492–504, 2008.

[5] D. Batenkov. Complete Algebraic Reconstruction of Piecewise-Smooth Functions from Fourier Data. *To appear in Mathematics of Computation.*

[6] D. Batenkov. *Algebraic reconstruction of geometric models from integral measurements.* PhD thesis, Weizmann Institute of Science, 2014.

[7] D. Batenkov and Y. Yomdin. On the accuracy of solving confluent Prony systems. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 73(1):134–154, 2013.

[8] Dmitry Batenkov. Prony Systems via Decimation and Homotopy Continuation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Symposium on Symbolic-Numeric Computation*, SNC '14, page 59–60, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.

[9] Dmitry Batenkov and Yosef Yomdin. Local and global geometry of Prony systems and Fourier reconstruction of piecewise-smooth functions. *To appear in Abel Symposia*, 2013.

[10] B. Beckermann, G. H. Golub, and G. Labahn. On the numerical condition of a generalized Hankel eigenvalue problem. *Numerische Mathematik*, 106(1):41–68, March 2007.

[11] Z. Ben-Haim, T. Michaeli, and Y.C. Eldar. Performance Bounds and Design Criteria for Estimating Finite Rate of Innovation Signals. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(8):4993–5015, 2012.

[12] Emmanuel J. Candès and Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Super-resolution from noisy data. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 19(6):1229–1254, December 2013.

[13] Emmanuel J. Candès and Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Towards a mathematical theory of super-resolution. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 67(6):906–956, June 2014.

[14] D.L. Donoho. Superresolution via sparsity constraints. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 23(5):1309–1331, 1992.

[15] P. L. Dragotti, M. Vetterli, and T. Blu. Sampling moments and reconstructing signals of finite rate of innovation: Shannon meets strang-fix. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 55(5):1741, 2007.

[16] Michael Elad, Peyman Milanfar, and Gene H. Golub. Shape from moments-an estimation theory perspective. *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, 52(7):1814–1829, 2004.

[17] Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Support detection in super-resolution. In *Proc. of 10th Sampling Theory and Applications (SAMPTA)*, pages 145—148, 2013.

[18] W. Gautschi. On inverses of Vandermonde and confluent Vandermonde matrices. *Numerische Mathematik*, 4(1):117–123, 1962.

[19] W. Gautschi. On inverses of Vandermonde and confluent Vandermonde matrices. II. *Numerische Mathematik*, 5(1):425–430, 1963.

[20] G. H. Golub, P. Milanfar, and J. Varah. A Stable Numerical Method for Inverting Shape from Moments. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 21(4):1222–1243, 2000.

[21] B. Gustafsson, C. He, P. Milanfar, and M. Putinar. Reconstructing planar domains from their moments. *Inverse Problems*, 16(4):1053–1070, 2000.

[22] Nicholas J. Higham. A survey of componentwise perturbation theory in numerical linear algebra. In *Proceedings of symposia in applied mathematics*, volume 48, page 49–77, 1994.

[23] Erich L. Kaltofen. Cleaning-up data for sparse model synthesis: When symbolic-numeric computation meets error-correcting codes. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Symposium on Symbolic-Numeric Computation*, SNC '14, pages 1–2, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.

[24] S.M. Kay. *Fundamentals of Statistical Signal Processing.* Prentice-Hall, 1993.

[25] S.H. Kia, H. Henao, and G.-A. Capolino. A High-Resolution Frequency Estimation Method for Three-Phase Induction Machine Fault Detection. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 54(4):2305–2314, August 2007.

[26] Yong-Hwa Kim, Young-Woo Youn, Don-Ha Hwang, Jong-Ho Sun, and Dong-Sik Kang. High-Resolution Parameter Estimation Method to Identify Broken Rotor Bar Faults in Induction Motors. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 60(9):4103–4117, September 2013.

[27] Julius Kusuma and Vivek K Goyal. On the accuracy and resolution of powersum-based sampling methods. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 57(1):182–193, 2009.

[28] Wenjing Liao and Albert Fannjiang. MUSIC for single-snapshot spectral estimation: Stability

and super-resolution. *arXiv:1404.1484 [cs, math]*, April 2014.
[29] I. Maravic and M. Vetterli. Sampling and reconstruction of signals with finite rate of innovation in the presence of noise. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 53(8 Part 1):2788–2805, 2005.
[30] Ankur Moitra. The Threshold for Super-resolution via Extremal Functions. *arXiv:1408.1681 [cs, math, stat]*, August 2014. arXiv: 1408.1681.
[31] Dianne P. O'Leary and Bert W. Rust. Variable projection for nonlinear least squares problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 54(3):579–593, 2013.
[32] Victor Pereyra and Godela Scherer. *Exponential Data Fitting and Its Applications*. Bentham Science Publishers, January 2010.
[33] T. Peter, D. Potts, and M. Tasche. Nonlinear approximation by sums of exponentials and translates. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 33(4):1920, 2011.
[34] R. Prony. Essai experimental et analytique. *J. Ec. Polytech.(Paris)*, 2:24–76, 1795.
[35] B. D. Rao and K. S. Arun. Model based processing of signals: A state space approach. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 80(2):283–309, 1992.
[36] R. Schappelle. The inverse of the confluent Vandermonde matrix. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 17(5):724–725, 1972.
[37] Avram Sidi. *Practical extrapolation methods: Theory and applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
[38] A. Spitzbart. A generalization of Hermite's interpolation formula. *American Mathematical Monthly*, pages 42–46, 1960.
[39] Hans J. Stetter. *Numerical polynomial algebra*. SIAM, 2004.
[40] Michael L. Van Blaricum and Raj Mittra. Problems and solutions associated with Prony's method for processing transient data. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, AP-26(1):174–182, 1978.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 2.3.

DEFINITION A.1. *Let* $\{\ell_j, z_j\}_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$ *be given. Let* $F := \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} \ell_j$. *The* Pascal - Vandermonde *matrix is the* $F \times F$ *matrix*

$$V = V(z_1, \ell_1, \ldots, z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{v_0}(z_1, \ell_1) & \boldsymbol{v_0}(z_2, \ell_2) & \ldots & \boldsymbol{v_0}(z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) \\ \boldsymbol{v_1}(z_1, \ell_1) & \boldsymbol{v_1}(z_2, \ell_2) & \ldots & \boldsymbol{v_1}(z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{v_{F-1}}(z_1, \ell_1) & \boldsymbol{v_{F-1}}(z_2, \ell_2) & \ldots & \boldsymbol{v_{F-1}}(z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{v_k}(z_j, \ell_j) := z_j^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 & k & k^2 & \ldots & k^{\ell_j - 1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

DEFINITION A.2. *Under the above notations, the* confluent Vandermonde *matrix is the* $F \times F$ *matrix*

$$U = U(z_1, \ell_1, \ldots, z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{u_0}(z_1, \ell_1) & \boldsymbol{u_0}(z_2, \ell_2) & \ldots & \boldsymbol{u_0}(z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) \\ \boldsymbol{u_1}(z_1, \ell_1) & \boldsymbol{u_1}(z_2, \ell_2) & \ldots & \boldsymbol{u_1}(z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{u_{F-1}}(z_1, \ell_1) & \boldsymbol{u_{F-1}}(z_2, \ell_2) & \ldots & \boldsymbol{u_{F-1}}(z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{u_k}(z_j, \ell_j) := \begin{bmatrix} z_j^k, & k z_j^{k-1}, & \ldots & , (k)_{\ell_j - 1} z_j^{k - \ell_j + 1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and $(k)_\ell$ *is the Pochhammer symbol for the falling factorial*

$$(k)_\ell := k(k-1) \cdot \cdots \cdot (k - \ell + 1).$$

DEFINITION A.3. *For every $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{N}$, let $T_{x,c}$ denote the $c \times c$ matrix*

$$T_{x,c} := \operatorname{diag}\left\{1, x, x^2, \ldots, x^{c-1}\right\}.$$

Clearly,

$$(T_{x,c})^{-1} = T_{x^{-1},c}.$$

DEFINITION A.4. *Let $\mathcal{S}_m$ denote the $m \times m$ upper triangular matrix*

$$\mathcal{S}_m := \begin{bmatrix} \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} & \cdots & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} m-1 \\ 0 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} \\ 0 & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} & \cdots & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} m-1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} m-1 \\ m-1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ is the Stirling number of the second kind [1, Section 24.1].

A direct consequence of the well-known formula for $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$, namely

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_j - 1} \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} \ell_j - 1 \\ \ell \end{smallmatrix} \right\} (k)_\ell = k^\ell,$$

is the following identity, connecting confluent and Pascal-Vandermonde matrices.

PROPOSITION A.5. *The confluent Vandermonde and Pascal-Vandermonde matrices satisfy*

$$V\left(z_1, \ell_1, \ldots, z_\mathcal{K}, \ell_\mathcal{K}\right) = U\left(z_1, \ell_1, \ldots, z_\mathcal{K}, \ell_\mathcal{K}\right) \times \operatorname{diag}\left\{T_{z_j,\ell_j} \mathcal{S}_{\ell_j}\right\}_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}}.$$

The confluent Vandermonde matrix U is well-studied in numerical analysis due to its central role in polynomial interpolation. The following fact is well-known [7].

PROPOSITION A.6. *The matrix $U\left(z_1, \ell_1, \ldots, z_\mathcal{K}, \ell_\mathcal{K}\right)$ is invertible if and only if the nodes $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$ are pairwise distinct.*

Now we state the key estimate used to prove Theorem 2.3.

THEOREM A.7. *Let $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ be pairwise distinct complex numbers with $|x_j| \leq 1$, satisfying the separation condition $|x_i - x_j| \geq \zeta > 0$ for $i \neq j$. Further, let $\{\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_n\}$ be an ordered collection of natural numbers such that $\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \cdots + \ell_n = N$. Denote*

by $\boldsymbol{u}_{j,k}$ the row with index $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{j-1} + k + 1$ of $[U(x_1, \ell_1, \ldots, x_n, \ell_n)]^{-1}$ (for $k = 0, 1, \ldots, \ell_j - 1$). Then the ℓ_1-norm of $\boldsymbol{u}_{j,k}$ satisfies

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}_{j,k}\|_1 := \sum_{s=1}^{N} \left|(\boldsymbol{u}_{j,k})_s\right| \leqslant \left(\frac{2}{\zeta}\right)^{N-\ell_j} \frac{2^k}{k!} \left(1 + \frac{2N}{\zeta}\right)^{\ell_j - 1 - k}. \tag{A.1}$$

The proof of this theorem (see below) combines original Gautschi's technique [19] and the well-known explicit expressions for the entries of U^{-1} from [36], plus a technical lemma (Lemma A.9).

DEFINITION A.8. *For $j = 1, \ldots, n$ let*

$$h_j(x) = \prod_{i \neq j} (x - x_i)^{-\ell_i}. \tag{A.2}$$

LEMMA A.9. *For any natural k, the k-th derivative of h_j at x_j satisfies*

$$\left|h_j^{(k)}(x_j)\right| \leqslant N(N+1)\cdots(N+k-1)\zeta^{-N-k+\ell_j}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on k. For $k = 0$ we have immediately $|h_j(x_j)| \leqslant \delta^{-N+\ell_j}$. Now

$$h_j'(x) = h_j(x) \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{-\ell_i}{x - x_i}. \tag{A.3}$$

By the Leibnitz rule we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_j^{(k)}(x) &= \left(\frac{h_j'}{h_j} h_j\right)^{(k-1)} \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{r} h_j^{(r)}(x) \left(\frac{h_j'}{h_j}\right)^{(k-1-r)} \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{r} h_j^{(r)}(x) \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{(-1)^{k-r-1}(k-r-1)!\ell_i}{(x - x_i)^{k-r}}, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\left|h_j^{(k)}(x_j)\right| \leqslant \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{r} \left|h_j^{(r)}(x_j)\right| \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{(k-r-1)!\ell_i}{|x_j - x_i|^{k-r}}.$$

This implies, together with the induction hypothesis, that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|h_j^{(k)}(x_j)\right| &\leqslant \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{r} \frac{N(N+1)\cdots(N+r-1)}{\zeta^{N+r-\ell_j}} \cdot \frac{(k-r-1)!N}{\zeta^{k-r}} \\ &= \frac{N}{\zeta^{N+k-\ell_j}} \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \frac{(k-1)!}{r!} N(N+1)\cdots(N+r-1) \\ &= \frac{(k-1)!N}{\zeta^{N+k-\ell_j}} \sum_{r=0}^{k-1} \binom{N-1+r}{r}. \end{aligned}$$

By a well-known binomial identity (proof is immediate by induction and Pascal's rule) we have

$$\sum_{r=0}^{k-1}\binom{N-1+r}{r}=\binom{N+k-1}{k-1}.$$

Therefore

$$\left|h_j^{(k)}(x_j)\right|\leqslant\frac{N(N+1)\cdots(N+k-1)}{\zeta^{N+k-\ell_j}},$$

as required. □

Proof. [of Theorem A.7] By using a generalization of the Hermite interpolation formula ([38]), it is shown in [36] that the components of the row $\boldsymbol{u}_{j,k}$ are just the coefficients of the polynomial

$$\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{t=0}^{\ell_j-1-k}\frac{1}{t!}h_j^{(t)}(x_j)(x-x_j)^{k+t}\prod_{i\neq j}(x-x_i)^{\ell_i},$$

where $h_j(x)$ is given by (A.2). By [18, Lemma], the sum of absolute values of the coefficients of the polynomials $(x-x_j)^{k+t}\prod_{i\neq j}(x-x_i)^{\ell_i}$ is at most

$$(1+|x_j|)^{k+t}\prod_{i\neq j}(1+|x_i|)^{\ell_i}\leqslant 2^{N-(\ell_j-k-t)}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{u}_{j,k}\|_1&\leqslant\frac{1}{k!}\sum_{t=0}^{\ell_j-1-k}\frac{1}{t!}\frac{N(N+1)\cdots(N+t-1)}{\zeta^{N+t-\ell_j}}2^{N-\ell_j+k+t}\\&=\left(\frac{2}{\zeta}\right)^{N-\ell_j}\frac{2^k}{k!}\sum_{t=0}^{\ell_j-1-k}\binom{\ell_j-1-k}{t}\frac{N(N+1)\cdots(N+t-1)}{(\ell_j-k-t)\cdots(\ell_j-k-2)(\ell_j-k-1)}\left(\frac{2}{\zeta}\right)^t\\&\leqslant\left(\frac{2}{\zeta}\right)^{N-\ell_j}\frac{2^k}{k!}\left(1+\frac{2N}{\zeta}\right)^{\ell_j-1-k},\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof (in the last transition we used $\frac{N+r}{s+r}\leqslant\frac{Ns+rN}{s+r}=N$, where $s=\ell_j-k-t\geqslant 1$ and $r=0,\ldots,t-1$). □

Now we state a similar bound for the Pascal-Vandermonde matrix V.

COROLLARY A.10. *Assume that $|z_j|=1$, with $|z_i-z_j|\geq\zeta>0$. Denote by $\boldsymbol{v}_{j,k}$ the row with index*

$$\ell_1+1+\cdots+\ell_{j-1}+1+k+1 \tag{A.4}$$

of $\{V(z_1,\ell_1+1,\ldots,z_K,\ell_K+1)\}^{-1}$ (for $k=0,1,\ldots,\ell_j$). Then there exists a constant C, not depending on ζ, such that

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}_{j,k}\|_1\leqslant C\cdot\left(\frac{1}{\zeta}\right)^{R-k} \tag{A.5}$$

where $R = \sum_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}} (\ell_j + 1) = F + \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Denote by $u_{j,k}$ the row with index (A.4) of

$$\{U(z_1, \ell_1 + 1, \ldots, z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}} + 1)\}^{-1}.$$

Since $\left(T_{z_j,\ell_j}\mathcal{S}_{\ell_j}\right)^{-1}$ is block upper triangular with entries bounded by a constant[2], say, C^*, we have by Theorem A.7 (obviously $\zeta < 2R$)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{v}_{j,k}\|_1 &\leqslant \ell_j \cdot C^* \cdot \max_{t=k,\ldots,\ell_j} \|u_{j,t}\|_1 \\
&\leqslant C^* \ell_j \left(\frac{2}{\zeta}\right)^{R-\ell_j} \max_{t=k,\ldots,\ell_j} \frac{2^t}{t!} \left(\frac{4R}{\zeta}\right)^{(\ell_j+1)-1-t} \\
&\leqslant C \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\zeta}\right)^{R-k},
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. □

Definition A.11. *For every* $j = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}$ *let us denote by* E_j *the following* $(\ell_j + 1) \times (\ell_j + 1)$ *block*

$$E_j = E_j(\mathbf{x}) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \frac{a_{0,j}}{z_j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{a_{\ell_j-1,j}}{z_j} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A.6}$$

Subsequently, we denote by E *the block diagonal* $R \times R$ *matrix*

$$E = E(\mathbf{x}) := \operatorname{diag}\{E_1, \ldots, E_{\mathcal{K}}\}. \tag{A.7}$$

Proposition A.12. *Direct calculation gives*

$$E_j^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \ldots & -\frac{a_{0,j}}{a_{\ell_j-1,j}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \ldots & -\frac{a_{1,j}}{a_{\ell_j-1,j}} \\ & & & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & +\frac{z_j}{a_{\ell_j-1,j}} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{A.8}$$

[2]It is well-known that

$$\mathcal{S}_m^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} & \cdots & \begin{bmatrix} m-1 \\ 0 \\ m-1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 & & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & & \begin{bmatrix} m-1 \\ m-1 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}$ is the Stirling number of the first kind.

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 2.3]

For the Jacobian matrix of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}$, we have the following factorization by a straightforward computation:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathbf{x}) = V(z_1, \ell_1 + 1, \ldots, z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}} + 1) \times E(\mathbf{x}).$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{R}}{}^{-1} = \operatorname{diag}\left\{E_j^{-1}\right\} V^{-1}.$$

Combining this with (A.8), (2.3) and Corollary A.10, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.3. □

Appendix B. Proof of Theorem 2.4.

First we introduce rectangular Pascal-Vandermonde matrices and study the asymptotics of the entries of their pseudo-inverses, for the nodes on the unit circle.

Definition B.1. *Let $\{\ell_j, z_j\}_{j=1}^{\mathcal{K}}$ be given. For any $t = 0, 1, \ldots,$ and $j = 1, \ldots, \mathcal{K}$, denote by $\mathbf{w}_{j,N}^{(t)}$ the column vector (where $0^0 = 1$)*

$$\mathbf{w}_{j,N}^{(t)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0^t \\ z_j \\ 2^t z_j^2 \\ \vdots \\ (N-1)^t z_j^{N-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this notation, we define the following $N \times R$ matrix:

$$W_N = W_N(z_1, \ell_1, \ldots, z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}}) := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}_{1,N}^{(0)} & \ldots & \mathbf{w}_{1,N}^{(\ell_1)} & \ldots & \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{K},N}^{(0)} & \ldots & \mathbf{w}_{\mathcal{K},N}^{(\ell_{\mathcal{K}})} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We also put

$$\mathcal{W} := W_N^* W_N \in \mathbb{C}^{R \times R}.$$

Recalling Definition A.1, note that $W_R = V(z_1, \ell_1 + 1, \ldots, z_{\mathcal{K}}, \ell_{\mathcal{K}} + 1)$. Thus we immediately obtain the following corollary of Proposition A.6.

Proposition B.2. *Suppose that $\{z_j\}$ are pairwise distinct. Then, for $N \geqslant R$, the matrix W_N has full column rank, and thus $\mathcal{W}$ has full rank.*

The next claim is easily verified by observation.

Proposition B.3. *The matrix $\mathcal{W}$ has an explicit block structure as follows:*

$$\mathcal{W} = [B_{rs}]_{1 \leqslant r,s \leqslant \mathcal{K}},$$

where B_{rs} is a rectangular $(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_s+1)$ block

$$B_{rs}=\left[b_{i,j}^{(r,s)}\right]_{0\leqslant i\leqslant \ell_r,\ 0\leqslant j\leqslant \ell_s}$$

and

$$b_{i,j}^{(r,s)}=\left[\mathbf{w}_{r,N}^{(i)}\right]^{*}\mathbf{w}_{s,N}^{(j)}=\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1}\ell^{i+j}\left(z_r^{*}z_s\right)^{\ell}. \tag{B.1}$$

PROPOSITION B.4. *The entries $b_{i.j}^{(r,s)}$ defined in* (B.1) *satisfy, as $N>K_1$ for some constant K_1 (depending only on $i+j$)*

$$\left|b_{i,j}^{(r,s)}\right|\leqslant\begin{cases}\frac{2}{i+j+1}N^{i+j+1} & r=s,\\ 4\delta_{rs}^{-1}N^{i+j} & r\neq s,\end{cases}$$

where $\delta_{rs}:=|\arg z_r^{*}z_s|$ (as in Definition 2.2).

Proof. Let $u_{rs}=z_r^{*}z_s$. It is a complex number on the unit circle. Let q be a non-negative integer. Consider two cases.

1. $r=s$ and so $u_{rs}=1$. In this case $b_{i,j}^{(r,r)}$ is the so-called *harmonic sum (generalized harmonic number)*

$$b_{i,j}^{(r,r)}=\sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1}\ell^{i+j}=h_{N,i+j}.$$

   For instance, $h_{N,0}=N$, $h_{N,1}=1+\cdots+(N-1)=\frac{N(N-1)}{2}$. In general, $h_{N,q}$ is a polynomial in N with leading term $\frac{1}{q+1}N^{q+1}$.
2. $r\neq s$. Let $u_{rs}:=z$ and consider

$$f_{N,q}(z):=\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}k^{q}z^{k}.$$

   We evaluate the above expression using summation by parts. Define sequences $A_k:=k^q$ and

$$B_k:=1+z+\cdots+z^{k-1}.$$

   That is, $B_{k+1}-B_k=z^k$ with $B_0:=0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}f_{N,q}(z)&=\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}A_k\left(B_{k+1}-B_k\right)\\&=A_NB_N-A_0B_0-\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}B_{k+1}\left(A_{k+1}-A_k\right)\\&=N^qB_N-\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\left[(k+1)^q-k^q\right]B_k.\end{aligned}$$

Now put $z = \exp(\imath t)$ (without loss of generality for $0 < t < \pi$). Then obviously for any non-negative integer k we have

$$|B_k|^2 = \left|\frac{z^{k+1}-1}{z-1}\right|^2 = \left|\frac{\sin(k+1)\frac{t}{2}}{\sin\frac{t}{2}}\right|^2,$$

and thus $|B_k| \leqslant \frac{2}{t}$. Therefore

$$|f_{N,q}(z)| \leqslant \frac{2}{t}\left\{N^q + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\left[(k+1)^q - k^q\right]\right\} = \frac{4}{t}N^q.$$

This proves the claim. □

Now we move on to study $\mathcal{W}^{-1}$.

PROPOSITION B.5. *The square matrix B_{rr} is invertible, with (i,j)-th entry (i,j starting from 1) of the inverse satisfying for $N > K_2$*

$$\left(B_{rr}^{-1}\right)_{i,j} \leqslant C_1 \cdot \frac{q_{i,j}}{N^{i+j-1}},$$

where $q_{i.j}$ is the $(i.j)$-th entry of the inverse $(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_r+1)$ Hilbert matrix, and C_1, as well as K_2, do not depend on N.

Proof. Use formula for component-wise perturbation of matrix inverse. Namely, write

$$B_{rr} = H_{\ell_r} + \Delta H$$

where H_{ℓ_r} is the scaled $(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_r+1)$ Hilbert matrix

$$H_{\ell_r} = \left(\frac{N^{i+j-1}}{i+j-1}\right)_{i,j}. \tag{B.2}$$

Given any matrix A, let us denote by $|A|$ the matrix of absolute values of entries of A. Now we have $|\Delta H| \leqslant \epsilon |H_{\ell_r}|$ for $\epsilon \sim N^{-1}$. It is immediately checked that

$$H_{\ell_r}^{-1} = \left(\frac{q_{i,j}}{N^{i+j-1}}\right)_{i,j} \tag{B.3}$$

where $q_{i,j}$ is the $(i.j)$-th entry of the inverse $(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_r+1)$ Hilbert matrix.

Then (see [22, Section 3]) to first order in ϵ we have $B_{rr}^{-1} = H_{\ell_r}^{-1} + \Delta B_{rr}^{-1}$ where

$$\left|\Delta B_{rr}^{-1}\right| \sim \left|H_{\ell_r}^{-1}\right| |H_{\ell_r}| \left|H_{\ell_r}^{-1}\right| \epsilon.$$

Taking into account the order of magnitudes specified by (B.2) and (B.3) we easily obtain that the order of growth of $\left(B_{rr}^{-1}\right)_{i,j}$ is

$$\frac{q_{i.j}}{N^{i+j-1}} + O\left(N^{-i-j}\right).$$

Since the entries of B_{rr} are polynomials in N (see Proposition B.4), the entries of B_{rr}^{-1} are rational functions in N, and thus we obtain the desired result. □

Now we come to the main structure result for $\mathcal{W}$.

DEFINITION B.6. *Given the structure vector* $\boldsymbol{\ell} = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{\mathcal{K}})$, *let* $D_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}$ *denote the following block diagonal matrix:*

$$D_{\boldsymbol{\ell}} = \operatorname{diag}\{B_{11}, \ldots, B_{\mathcal{K}\mathcal{K}}\}.$$

Recall that the matrix $\mathcal{W}$ consists of the rectangular blocks B_{rs}. The following claim is straightforward.

PROPOSITION B.7. *We have*

$$\mathcal{W} = D_\ell \times X,$$

where $X \in \mathbb{C}^{R\times R}$ *has the block structure*

$$X = [C_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant \mathcal{K}},$$

each C_{rs} *being a* $(\ell_r + 1) \times (\ell_s + 1)$ *block*

$$C_{rs} = B_{rr}^{-1} \times B_{rs}.$$

So in particular $C_{rr} = I_{(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_r+1)}$.

Now using Proposition B.4 and Proposition B.5 we easily obtain the following.

PROPOSITION B.8. *For* $r \neq s$, *the* (i, j)*-th entry of* C_{rs} *(counting starts from* 1*) satisfies, for* $N > K_2$ *and some constant* C_2

$$\left|[C_{rs}]_{i,j}\right| \leqslant C_2 \cdot \delta^{-1} N^{-i+j-1}.$$

Next we denote $Y := I_{R\times R} - X$. By induction on k, it is easy to prove the following fact.

PROPOSITION B.9. *For each* $k = 1, 2, \ldots,$ *the matrix* Y^k *has the block structure*

$$Y^k = \left[T_{rs}^{(k)}\right]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant \mathcal{K}},$$

where $T_{rs}^{(k)}$ *is a* $(\ell_r + 1) \times (\ell_s + 1)$ *block, whose* $(i.j)$*-th entry satisfies, for* $N > K_2$ *and some constant* C_3

$$\left|\left[T_{rs}^{(k)}\right]_{i,j}\right| \leqslant C_3 \cdot \frac{R^{k-1}}{\delta^k} N^{-i+j-k}.$$

This immediately leads to the following conclusion.

PROPOSITION B.10. *For* $N > K_3 := \max\left(\frac{R}{\delta}, K_2\right)$ *the Neumann series* $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Y^k$ *converges, and thus* $X = I - Y$ *is invertible, with*

$$X^{-1} = I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Y^k = I + Z,$$

where Z has the same block structure as X, i.e. $Z = [\Xi_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant \mathcal{K}}$, with Ξ_{rs} being a $(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_s+1)$ block, whose (i,j)-th entry satisfies, for some constant C_4

$$\left|[\Xi_{rs}]_{i,j}\right| \leqslant C_4 \cdot \frac{1}{1-\frac{R}{N\delta}} \cdot \begin{cases} N^{-i+j-1} & r \neq s, \\ N^{-i+j-2} & r = s \end{cases}.$$

Now, since $\mathcal{W} = D_\ell\,(I - Y)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}^{-1} &= X^{-1} D_\ell^{-1} = (I+Z)\, D_\ell^{-1} \\ &= D_\ell^{-1} + [\Xi_{rs}]\, \mathrm{diag}\left\{B_{tt}^{-1}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using all the above structural results, we obtain the following asymptotic description of the blocks of $\mathcal{W}^{-1}$.

PROPOSITION B.11. *The matrix $\mathcal{W}^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}^{R\times R}$ has the block form*

$$\mathcal{W}^{-1} = [\mathcal{V}_{rs}]_{1\leqslant r,s\leqslant \mathcal{K}},$$

where each $\mathcal{V}_{rs}$ is a $(\ell_r+1)\times(\ell_s+1)$ block, whose (i,j)-th entry satisfies, for some constant C_5 and $N > K_3$,

$$\left|[\mathcal{V}_{rs}]_{i,j}\right| \leqslant C_5 \cdot \frac{1}{1-\frac{R}{N\delta}} \cdot \begin{cases} N^{-i-j+1} & r = s, \\ N^{-i-j} & r \neq s. \end{cases}$$

So we actually have proved the following result.

THEOREM B.12. *Consider the pseudo-inverse $W_N^\dagger = \mathcal{W}^{-1} W_N^* \in \mathbb{C}^{R\times N}$ Pascal-Vandermonde matrix as a striped matrix, i.e. $W_N^\dagger = [\mathbf{v}_{\ell,j}]_{1\leqslant j\leqslant \mathcal{K}}^{0\leqslant \ell\leqslant \ell_j}$, where each $\mathbf{v}_{\ell,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{1\times N}$ is a row vector. Then as $N > K_4 := \max\left(K_3, \frac{2R}{\delta}\right)$, the magnitudes of the entries of $\mathbf{v}_{\ell,j}$ are bounded by $C_6 \cdot N^{-\ell-1}$, where C_6 depends only on the problem structure vector $\boldsymbol{\ell}$.*

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 2.4]

For the Jacobian matrix $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) = d\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times R}$, direct computation gives

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathbf{x}) = W_N \times E,$$

where E is defined in (A.7). Combining this with Proposition B.2 proves the assertion about $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}$ having full rank.

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}{}^\dagger = \left(\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}{}^* \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}{}^* &= \left(E^* W_N^* W_N E\right)^{-1} E^* W_N^* = E^{-1} \mathcal{W}^{-1} \left(E^*\right)^{-1} E^* W_N^* \\ &= E^{-1} \mathcal{W}^{-1} W_N^* = E^{-1} W_N^\dagger. \end{aligned}$$

Consider $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}{}^\dagger \in \mathbb{C}^{R\times N}$ as a striped matrix, i.e. $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{N}}{}^\dagger = [\mathbf{j}_{\ell,j}]_{1\leqslant j\leqslant \mathcal{K}}^{0\leqslant \ell\leqslant \ell_j}$ where each $\mathbf{j}_{\ell,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{1\times N}$ is a row vector. Using (A.8) and Theorem B.12, we obtain that for $N > K_4$ and some constant C_7

$$\left|\left(\mathbf{j}_{\ell,j}\right)_t\right| \leqslant C_7 \cdot \begin{cases} \left(1 + \frac{|a_{\ell-1,j}|}{\left|a_{\ell_j-1,j}\right|}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{N^{\ell+1}} & 0 \leqslant \ell < \ell_j, \\ \frac{1}{\left|a_{\ell_j-1,j}\right|} \cdot \frac{1}{N^{\ell_j+1}} & \ell = \ell_j. \end{cases}$$

The second claim of Theorem 2.4 immediately follows.□